

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Enclosed herein are Replacement Sheets of formal drawing Figures 7A, 7B, 8A and 8B, which have been amended herein to include a --Prior Art-- legend, because only that which is old is illustrated therein.

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending. By this Amendment, Claim 1 is amended. Because support for the amendment to Claim 1 is provided in originally filed drawing Figures 1, 2B, 3A-B, and 5A-B, Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is presented herein.

Personal Interview

Applicant respectfully acknowledges and appreciates the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Nguyen during the personal interview conducted on January 12, 2006. The points discussed during the interview are incorporated herein.

Drawings

Figures 7A, 7B, 8A and 8B are objected to and are required to include a --Prior Art-- legend because only that which is old is illustrated therein. Enclosed herein are Replacement Sheets of formal drawing Figures 7A, 7B, 8A and 8B, which have been amended herein to include a --Prior Art-- legend, because only that which is old is illustrated therein. As such, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

Claims 1-8 Recite Patentable Subject Matter

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 4,938,463 to Miyamoto in view of U.S. Patent Number 4,817,925 to Sprang et al. (Sprang), and further in view of the Admitted Prior Art (APA) in page 1 of the specification. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites a liquid sealed mount device including, among other features, a first mounting member; a second mounting member made of resin; and an elastic

material bridging the gap between the first mounting member and the second mounting member, wherein a lowermost surface of the elastic material is coplanar with a lowermost surface of the second mounting member. See Figures 1, 2B, 3A-B, and 5A-B of the instant application.

Applicant respectfully submits Miyamoto, Sprang and the APA fail to teach or suggest the lowermost surface of an elastic member bridging a gap between a first mounting member and a second mounting member is coplanar with a lowermost surface of the second mounting member.

Referring to Figure 1, Miyamoto clearly shows the lowermost surface of the elastic member 10 is not coplanar with the lowermost surface of the second mounting member 5. Rather, the lowermost surface of the elastic member 10 terminates or coincides with an intermediate portion of the second mounting member 5.

Referring to Figure 1, Sprang clearly show the lowermost surface of the elastic member 5 is not coplanar with the lowermost surface of the second mounting member 8 since the lowermost surface of the elastic member 5 terminates or coincides with an upper surface of the inwardly bent lower flange of the second mounting member 8.

Finally, referring to Figures 7A-8B of the APA, which correspond to the JP 08-247208 reference discussed during the January 12 interview, the lowermost surface of the elastic member 106 is not coplanar with the lowermost surface of the second mounting member 107 since the lowermost surface of the elastic member 106 terminates or coincides with an intermediate portion of the second mounting member 107.

To establish *prima facie* obviousness, each feature of a rejected claim must be taught or suggested by the applied art of record. See M.P.E.P. §2143.03. As explained above, Miyamoto, Sprang, and the APA, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a lowermost surface of the elastic material is coplanar with a lowermost surface of the second mounting member. As such, Applicant respectfully submits Claim 1 is not rendered obvious in view of Miyamoto, Sprang and the APA, alone or in any combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits Claim 1 should be deemed allowable.

Claims 2-8 depend from Claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that these seven dependent claims be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons Claim 1 is allowable, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits the rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding objection and rejection, allowance of Claims 1-8, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing docket number 107355-00113.**

Respectfully submitted,
ARENT FOX PLLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Murat Ozgu', is written over the printed name.

Murat Ozgu
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,275

Enclosure: Replacement Sheets of Formal Drawings 7A-8B

Customer No. 004372

1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: (202) 857-6000

CMM:MO/elp